

27 November 1963

Dear Tom:

Ref: CSA-5362-63

1. In reply to the reference letter with respect to the deductions made from our invoice #10-19 in the amount of \$303.68 affecting amounts previously invoiced and paid by you as follows:

[redacted]				STAT
Invoice No.	Period	On Base Mileage	Amount	
5-26	Jan 28 - Mar. 24, '63	1178	\$ 94.24	
7-35	Mar. 25 - Jun. 23 '63	2080	166.40	
		3258	\$260.64	
[redacted]				STAT
7-35	Vacation mileage to Burbank		43.04	
	Total		\$303.68	

2. With respect to the [redacted] item in the amount of \$260.64, the circumstances and justification for this expense is as follows:

a. [redacted] was assigned to Australia for a period longer than the ninety day rotation of military personnel. This extended assignment period for our Representative was requested by personnel of the 4080th Wing and approved by [redacted]. The purpose was to provide a source of continuity of events for the rotating military commanders.

b. Upon arrival in Australia and up to February 1963, [redacted] took quarters on the RAAF Base at which the aircraft were stationed. While quartered here, driving was limited to "On Base" activity and averaged about five to eight miles per day.

c. Living quarters assigned to [redacted] on the Base were extremely sub-standard. Such living conditions might have been acceptable for a short period of time, but definitely not for his extended assignment.

d. For the above reason, [redacted] moved off the Base in February and took rental quarters in Melbourne. Subsequent mileage reported included, driving from quarters to the Base and return, plus On Base mileage. This amounted to about 32 miles per day, which we feel to be reasonable and accurate.

3. With respect to the [redacted] item in the amount of \$43.04, we failed to fully identify this charge. It should have been listed as transportation to Burbank for combined refresher training and vacation. It has always been contractors' policy in connection with field employees to bring them back to Burbank once each year for a factory refresher course, and it has always been timed to coincide with the employees vacation period to minimize the time the employee is away from his field assignment. We believe that the refresher course and factory consultation is in the best interests of the Government and that the transportation costs incurred in returning such employees to Burbank are a valid Contract cost.

- 2 -

Such costs have consistently been billed to the Government throughout the life of Contract SC-58 and have always been approved for payment.

In view of the above explanation, we respectfully request that the costs deleted per Paragraph 1 be reinstated.

Very truly yours,



STAT